arXiv:1406.6162v1 [math.AP] 24 Jun 2014

RADIAL SYMMETRY AND APPLICATIONS FOR A PROBLEM INVOLVING THE $-\Delta_p(\cdot)$ OPERATOR AND CRITICAL NONLINEARITY IN $\mathbb{R}^N$

LUCIO DAMASCELLI[+], SUSANA MERCHÁN[*], LUIGI MONTORO[*], AND BERARDINO SCIUNZI[*]

Abstract. We consider weak non-negative solutions to the critical p-Laplace equation in $\mathbb{R}^N$

$$-\Delta_p u = u^{p^*-1}\,,$$

in the singular case $1 < p < 2$. We prove that if $p^* \geqslant 2$ then all the solutions in $\mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ are radial (and radially decreasing) about some point.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Symmetry of solutions 6
3. Proof of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 19
References 19

1. Introduction

We consider weak non-negative solutions to the critical p-Laplace equation in $\mathbb{R}^N$

$$u \geq 0\,, \quad u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)\,, \quad -\Delta_p u = u^{p^*-1} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \tag{1.1}$$

where $1 < p < 2 \leq N$, p^* is the critical exponent for the Sobolev immersion and we assume that the nonlinearity in (1.1) is locally Lipschitz continuous in $[0, +\infty)$, namely $p^* \geqslant 2$.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35J92,35B33,35B06.

[+] *Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Roma "Tor Vergata", V. della Ricerca Scientifica 1 Roma, Italy. E-mail:* damascel@mat.uniroma2.it.

[*] *Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, Università della Calabria, Ponte Pietro Bucci 31B, I-87036 Arcavacata di Rende, Cosenza, Italy, E-mail:* merchan@mat.unical.it, montoro@mat.unical.it, sciunzi@mat.unical.it.

BS were partially supported by ERC-2011-grant: Elliptic PDE's and symmetry of interfaces and layers for odd nonlinearities.

LM and BS were partially supported by PRIN-2011: Variational and Topological Methods in the Study of Nonlinear Phenomena.

We assume that $u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ which is a space naturally associated to the critical equation (1.1). Let us recall that

$$\mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) = \left\{ u \in L^{p^*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \,:\, \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^p < \infty \right\},$$

is the completion of $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with respect to the norm $\|\varphi\|_{D^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} := (\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla \varphi|^p)^{1/p}$.

Remark 1.1. *Any solution $u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ of (1.1) belongs to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$.*

This follows by exploiting the technique of [44] *(that goes back to* [32]*) and then the L^∞ estimates in* [38]*. The adaptation of this scheme to the quasilinear case is straightforward (following* [44] *we obtain that $\|u\|_{L^{\beta p^*}(B(x,r))} \leqslant C(r)$, with $C(r)$ not depending on x, for some $\beta > 1$, in fact we can take any β such that $1 \leqslant \beta < p^*/p$; the L^∞ estimate then follows by* [38, Theorem 1]*), see e.g.* [33] *for the details.*

Taking into account Remark 1.1, by standard $C^{1,\alpha}$ estimates (see [15, 26, 27, 43, 45]), we deduce that u is locally of class $C^{1,\alpha}$. This fact allows the use of the strong maximum principle (see [46]) to deduce that any nonnegative nontrivial solution to (1.1) is actually strictly positive.

So throughout the paper we can and will assume that a nonnegative nontrivial solution u to (1.1) satisfies

$$u > 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N\,, \quad u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap C^{1,\alpha}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)\,.$$

It is a key and open problem to understand if, under our assumptions, all the solutions to (1.1) are radial and radially decreasing.

In the semilinear case $p = 2$, with $N \geq 3$, the situation is well understood and it is well known that classical positive solutions to (1.1) are radial and radially decreasing.
This was first proved in [22] via the *Moving Plane Method* (see [39] and [21]) under suitable decay assumptions on the solution. Later, in [3], [4], the same result has been obtained, without any a-priori decay assumption, using the Kelvin transform. Consequently, the solutions to (1.1) in the case $p = 2$ can be classified (see [42]) up to translations and scale invariance. The classification of the solutions had a great impact in the literature and it has been exploited in many issues such as a-priori estimates, blow-up analysis and asymptotic analysis, providing striking results. We refer to [4] for the two dimensional case.

In the general quasilinear case the problem is still open, and we provide a partial answer in this paper in the singular case $1 < p < 2$ assuming that the nonlinearity u^{p^*-1} is locally Lipschitz continuous in $[0, +\infty)$, which is the case for $p^* \geqslant 2$.

The fact that the problem in the quasilinear setting is difficult to study depends not only on the lack of general comparison principles for quasilinear operators, but also on the fact that a Kelvin type transformation is not available in this case.
Let us mention that in [9, 10] (see also [40]) symmetry and monotonicity results have been

obtained, in the spirit of [22], under suitable a-priori assumptions on the solutions and/or the nonlinearity. In the applications such assumptions are not generally easy to check and this is the reason for which many issues in the context of a-priori estimates, blow-up analysis and asymptotic analysis are still not sufficiently understood.

Here we consider $1 < p < 2$ with $p^* \geqslant 2$ and we prove, exploiting the *Moving Plane Method* [39] and Sobolev's inequality (and a technique introduced in [8] to avoid "local symmetries"), the following

Theorem 1.2. *Let $u \in D^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be a (nonnegative and nontrivial, hence) positive solution to (1.1) and assume that $1 < p < 2$ and $p^* \geqslant 2$, namely $\frac{2N}{N+2} \leqslant p < 2$.*
Then u is radial with respect to some point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ which is the only critical point of u and it is strictly radially decreasing, i.e. there exists a C^1 function $v : [0, +\infty) \to (0, +\infty)$ such that $v'(r) < 0$ for any $r > 0$ and such that $u(x) = v(r), \ \ r = |x - x_0|$.

Remarkably, this allows us to exploit the classification results in [2, 23] and deduce that, for $\frac{2N}{N+2} \leqslant p < 2$, all the solutions to (1.1) belonging to $D^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ are given by the following expression:

$$\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,x_0} := \left[\frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \left(N^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\frac{N-p}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}\right)}{\lambda^{\frac{p}{p-1}} + |x - x_0|^{\frac{p}{p-1}}} \right]^{\frac{N-p}{p}}, \quad \lambda > 0 \qquad x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{1.2}$$

Note that, by [42], it follows that the family of functions given by (1.2) are minimizers to

$$S := \min_{\substack{\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) \\ \varphi \neq 0}} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla \varphi|^p dx}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi^{p^*} dx\right)^{\frac{p}{p^*}}} . \tag{1.3}$$

The adaptation of the moving plane procedure to the case of equations in bounded domains involving the p-Laplacian in the singular case $1 < p < 2$ was carried out in [6, 8]. The technique developed in [8] that allows to pass from local symmetry results to symmetry results was then exploited in the cited papers [9, 10] to prove symmetry results in $\mathbb{R}^N$, again in the singular case $1 < p < 2$. We will also exploit and explain this technique in Section 2.
The degenerate case $p > 2$ in bounded smooth domains and positive nonlinearities was considered in [11], [13] using extensively weighted Poincaré's type inequalities, that are not available in unbounded domains. The problem in half spaces has been studied in [12, 16, 17].

We point out also some first consequences of our symmetry result.
Once that Theorem 1.2 is available, exploiting the abstract results in [30], we can recover the compactness result of M. Struwe [41], for the case of p-Laplace equations.
To state this result, for $\varphi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, let us define first the energy functional

$$J(\varphi) = \frac{1}{p} \int_\Omega |\nabla \varphi|^p dx - \frac{1}{p^*} \int_\Omega \varphi^{p^*} dx \, ,$$

and for $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ let us also define,

$$J_\infty(\varphi) = \frac{1}{p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla \varphi|^p dx - \frac{1}{p^*}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi^{p^*} dx\,.$$

As a consequence of our symmetry result, we have the following

Theorem 1.3. *Let $1 < p < 2$ and assume that $p^* \geqslant 2$, namely $\frac{2N}{N+2} \leqslant p < 2$. Let $\{u_\varepsilon\} \subset W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be such that*

$$J(u_\varepsilon) \underset{\varepsilon\to 0}{\longrightarrow} c \quad \text{and} \quad J'(u_\varepsilon) \underset{\varepsilon\to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0, \ \text{in } W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$$

and

$$\|u_\varepsilon^-\|_{L^{p^*}(\Omega)} \to 0, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0\,.$$

Then, passing to a subsequence if it is necessary, there exist $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$, sequences $\{y_\varepsilon^i\} \subset \Omega$ and $\{\delta_\varepsilon^i\} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$, with $i = 1, \dots, k$, satisfying

$$\frac{1}{\delta_\varepsilon^i}\, dist\,(y_\varepsilon^i, \partial\Omega) \to \infty, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0,$$

and

$$\|u_\varepsilon(\cdot) - v_0 - \sum_{i=1}^k (\delta_\varepsilon^i)^{(p-N)/p} \mathcal{U}_{\lambda_i,x_i}((\cdot - y_\varepsilon^i)/\delta_\varepsilon^i)\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\Omega)} \to 0, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0\,, \tag{1.4}$$

for some $v_0 \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, nonnegative solution to $-\Delta_p w = w^{p^*-1}$ in Ω.
Furthermore,

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|^p_{\mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\Omega)} \to \|v_0\|^p_{\mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\Omega)} + \sum_{i=1}^k \|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda_i,x_i}\|^p_{\mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\Omega)}, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0\,,$$

and

$$J(v_0) + \sum_{i=1}^k J_\infty(\mathcal{U}_{\lambda_i,x_i}) = c\,. \tag{1.5}$$

In a forthcoming paper ([31]), exploiting Theorem 1.3, it is proved that the critical problem for the p-Laplacian can admit positive (nontrivial) solutions in some bounded domains that are not star shaped. This extends to the quasilinear context the classical Coron's result [5].

Furthermore, let us point out that, as in the semilinear case (see e.g. [1, 18, 25, 35]), our result can be applied in the asymptotic analysis of positive solutions to slightly subcritical problems. More precisely, given $\varepsilon > 0$ small, let us consider the following problem, where Ω is a bounded smooth domain

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon^{p^*-1-\varepsilon} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_\varepsilon = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega\,, \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

An analysis of *Mountain Pass* solutions to (1.6) has been developed in [20] (see also [19]). More precisely, exploiting the *concentration compactness principle* of P.L. Lions (see [28, 29]), it is proved in [20] that the sequence of mountain pass solutions converges in the sense of measures to a unique Dirac δ with mass $S^{\frac{N}{p}}$, being S the best Sobolev's constant (see (1.3)). Namely, the limit energy level is exactly $c = S^{\frac{N}{p}}/N$ in this case.

On the contrary, when dealing with higher energy level solutions, many problems remained unsolved because of the lack of a classification result for the critical problem in $\mathbb{R}^N$.
In [20, Theorem 9] the authors also considered the second energy level $S^{\frac{N}{p}}/N < c < 2S^{\frac{N}{p}}/N$ proving that the following alternative holds:

(a) the sequence converges to a solution of the critical problem in Ω.
(b) the sequence converges to a Dirac mass.

As a consequence of Theorem 1.3, we deduce that the second alternative (b) cannot occur in the case

$$S^{\frac{N}{p}}/N < c < 2S^{\frac{N}{p}}/N\,.$$

More precisely, we have the following:

Theorem 1.4. *Let $1 < p < 2$ and assume that $p^* \geqslant 2$, namely $\frac{2N}{N+2} \leqslant p < 2$. Let $\{u_\varepsilon\}$ be a family of nonnegative solutions to (1.6) such that*

$$J(u_\varepsilon) \underset{\varepsilon\to 0}{\longrightarrow} c \quad \text{and} \quad J'(u_\varepsilon) \underset{\varepsilon\to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0, \ \text{in } W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$$

with $\frac{S^{\frac{N}{p}}}{N} \leqslant c < 2\frac{S^{\frac{N}{p}}}{N}$. Then, the following alternative holds:

(i) the function v_0 in (1.4) is not trivial. In this case, (1.4) is fulfilled with $k = 0$, namely

$$\|u_\varepsilon(\cdot) - v_0\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\Omega)} \to 0, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0\,.$$

(ii) The function v_0 in (1.4) is trivial. This case can occur only if $c = \frac{S^{\frac{N}{p}}}{N}$ and (1.4) is fulfilled with $k = 1$, namely there exist $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, sequences $\{y_\varepsilon\} \subset \Omega$ and $\{\delta_\varepsilon\} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$, satisfying

$$\frac{1}{\delta_\varepsilon}\, dist\,(y_\varepsilon, \partial\Omega) \to \infty, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0,$$

and

$$\|u_\varepsilon(\cdot) - \delta_\varepsilon^{(p-N)/p}\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,x_0}((\cdot - y_\varepsilon)/\delta_\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\Omega)} \to 0, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0\,. \tag{1.7}$$

As a consequence, if $S^{\frac{N}{p}}/N < c < 2S^{\frac{N}{p}}/N$, then (i) occurs.

Remark 1.5. *For the reader's convenience we point out that, changing the parameters, (1.7) in Theorem 1.4 holds with $\lambda = 1$ and $x_0 = 0$. Namely, y_ε has to be replaced by $y_\varepsilon + \delta_\varepsilon x_0$ and δ_ε has to be replaced by $\lambda\delta_\varepsilon$.*

Remark 1.6. *Note that in Theorem 1.4 the case (i) is not possible if the domain is star shaped. In fact in this case, by a Pohozaev type identity (see* [7, 14, 24]*), it follows that v_0 has to be trivial.*

If instead the domain is not star shaped, then v_0 might be not trivial.
This is exactly what happens in the Coron type problem studied in [31]*, which exploits our result. In this case the energy level is, in fact, strictly grater than $S^{\frac{N}{p}}/N$.*

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we study the symmetry of the solutions in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and we prove Theorem 1.2. In Section 3 we prove Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4.

2. Symmetry of solutions

Definition 2.1. *We say that u is a nontrivial nonnegative weak solution to* (1.1) *if $u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $u \not\equiv 0$, $u \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, and*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^{p-2}\langle \nabla u, \nabla \phi\rangle \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^{p^*-1}\phi \, dx, \quad \forall \phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

As already remarked a nontrivial nonnegative solution is in fact bounded, positive in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and belongs to the class $C^{1,\alpha}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.
In the sequel we use the following standard estimate, whose proof can be found e.g. in [6].

Lemma 2.2. *$\forall\, p > 1$ there exist positive constants C_1, C_2, depending on p, such that $\forall\, \eta, \eta' \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $|\eta| + |\eta'| > 0$*

$$[|\eta|^{p-2}\eta - |\eta'|^{p-2}\eta'][\eta - \eta'] \geq C_1(|\eta| + |\eta'|)^{p-2}|\eta - \eta'|^2, \tag{2.1}$$

$$||\eta|^{p-2}\eta - |\eta'|^{p-2}\eta'| \leq C_2|\eta - \eta'|^{p-1}, \qquad \text{if} \quad 1 < p \leq 2.$$

Next we recall some known results about solutions of differential inequalities involving the p - Laplace operator. We begin with a strong comparison principle whose proof can be found in [6] (see also [34]).

Theorem 2.3 (Strong comparison principle)**.** *Suppose that Ω is a domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $u, v \in C^1(\Omega)$ weakly solve*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u \;\geq\; f(u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta_p v \;\leq\; f(v) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

with $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ locally Lipschitz continuous .
Suppose that $1 < p < \infty$ and define $Z_v^u = \{x \in \Omega : \nabla u(x) = \nabla v(x) = 0\}$. If $u \geq v$ in Ω and there exists $x_0 \in \Omega \setminus Z_v^u$ with $u(x_0) = v(x_0)$, then $u \equiv v$ in the connected component of $\Omega \setminus Z_v^u$ containing x_0.

Finally, we recall a version of the strong maximum principle and the Hopf's lemma for the p-Laplacian which is a particular case of a result proved in [46] (see also [34] and [6]).

Theorem 2.4 (Strong maximum principle and Hopf's Lemma)**.** *Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and suppose that $u \in C^1(\Omega), u \geq 0$ in Ω weakly solves*

$$-\Delta_p u + cu^q = g \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

with $1 < p < \infty$, $q \geq p-1$, $c \geq 0$ and $g \in L^\infty_{loc}(\Omega)$. If $u \not\equiv 0$, then $u > 0$ in Ω. Moreover, for any point $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ where the interior sphere condition is satisfied and $u \in C^1(\Omega \cup \{x_0\})$ and $u(x_0) = 0$, we have that $\frac{\partial u}{\partial s} > 0$ for any inward directional derivative (this means that if y approaches x_0 in a ball $B \subset \Omega$ that has x_0 on its boundary then $\lim_{y \to x_0} \frac{u(y)-u(x_0)}{|y-x_0|} > 0$.)

To state the next results we need some notations.
If ν is a direction in $\mathbb{R}^N$, i.e. $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $|\nu| = 1$, and λ is a real number we set

$$T^\nu_\lambda = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x \cdot \nu = \lambda\}.$$
$$\Sigma^\nu_\lambda = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x \cdot \nu < \lambda\},$$
$$x^\nu_\lambda = R^\nu_\lambda(x) = x + 2(\lambda - x \cdot \nu)\nu,$$

(i.e. R^ν_λ is the reflection trough the hyperplane T^ν_λ),

$$u^\nu_\lambda(x) = u(x^\nu_\lambda)\,.$$

We denote by Z_u the critical set of u defined by $Z_u = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \nabla u(x) = 0\}$ and we put

$$Z^\nu_\lambda = \{x \in \Sigma^\nu_\lambda : \nabla u(x) = \nabla u^\nu_\lambda(x) = 0\} \subseteq Z_u.$$

Finally we define

$$\Lambda(\nu) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \,:\, u \leq u^\nu_\mu \text{ in } \Sigma^\nu_\mu,\ \forall \mu \leq \lambda\}.$$

and if $\Lambda(\nu) \neq \emptyset$ we set

$$\lambda_0(\nu) = \sup \Lambda(\nu). \tag{2.2}$$

We will refer to $\Sigma^\nu_{\lambda_0}$ as the maximal cap. As a first step toward the proof of Theorem 1.2 we state and prove the following partial symmetry result.

Theorem 2.5 (Partial symmetry)**.** *Let $1 < p < 2$ with $p^* \geqslant 2$, namely $\frac{2N}{N+2} \leqslant p < 2$ and let u be a (positive) solution to (1.1) in the sense of Definition 2.1.*
Then, for every direction ν we have that $\Lambda(\nu) \neq \emptyset$, $\lambda_0(\nu)$ in (2.2) is (well defined and) finite, and one of the following conclusions occurs

- *(i) either $u \equiv u^\nu_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$ in $\Sigma^\nu_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$;*
- *(ii) or u has a local symmetry region, namely $u \not\equiv u^\nu_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$ in $\Sigma^\nu_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$ but $u \equiv u^\nu_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$ in $\mathcal{C}^\nu$, for some connected component $\mathcal{C}^\nu$ of $\Sigma^\nu_{\lambda_0(\nu)} \setminus Z^\nu_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$.*

In the latter case, for any connected component $\mathcal{C}^\nu$ of local symmetry, we also have

$$\nabla u(x) \neq 0 \quad \forall\, x \in C^\nu \text{ and } |\nabla u(x)| = |\nabla u^\nu_{\lambda_0(\nu)}| = 0 \quad \forall\, x \in \partial C^\nu \setminus T^\nu_{\lambda_0(\nu)}\,. \tag{2.3}$$

Moreover,

$$u < u^\nu_\lambda \quad \text{in} \quad \Sigma^\nu_\lambda \setminus Z^\nu_\lambda, \quad \forall \quad \lambda < \lambda_0(\nu), \tag{2.4}$$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(x) > 0 \quad \forall \quad x \in \Sigma^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)} \setminus Z\,. \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. In what follows, without loss of generality (being the $-\Delta_p(\cdot)$ operator invariant with respect to rotations), we will suppose, for simplicity of notations, that ν coincides with the $e_1 = (1, 0, \cdots, 0)$ direction and we omit the superscript in previous definitions, so that $\Sigma_\lambda = \Big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x_1 < \lambda\Big\}$, $T_\lambda = \Big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x_1 = \lambda\Big\}$, $x_\lambda = R_\lambda(x) = (2\lambda - x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_N)$, $u_\lambda(x) = u(x_\lambda)$, $Z_\lambda = \{x \in \Sigma_\lambda : \nabla u(x) = \nabla u_\lambda(x) = 0\} \subseteq Z_u$, $\Lambda := \Lambda(e_1) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \,:\, u \leq u_\mu \text{ in } \Sigma_\mu,\ \forall \mu \leq \lambda\}$.

To prove the proposition, we shall use the Moving Plane Method in the e_1-direction.

STEP 1 *Here we show that $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$, so that we can define $\lambda_0 = \sup \Lambda$, and that λ_0 is finite.*

We need to consider two different cases: the case $p^* > 2$ (namely $p > \frac{2N}{N+2}$), and the case $p^* = 2$ (namely $p = \frac{2N}{N+2}$). *Let us first deal with the case $p^* > 2$.*
By the summability assumptions on the solution it is possible to take the function $(u-v)^+$, $v = u_\lambda$, as a test function in the equations for u and in the equation for $v = u_\lambda$ in Σ_λ. More precisely, since u,v belong to $\mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and they coincide on the hyperplane T_λ, there exists a sequence φ_j of functions in $C_c^\infty(\Sigma_\lambda)$ such that $\varphi_j \to (v-u)^+$ in $L^{p^*}(\Sigma_\lambda)$ and $\nabla\varphi_j \to \nabla(v-u)^+$ in $L^p(\Sigma_\lambda)$. Moreover, passing to a subsequence and substituting if necessary φ_j with φ_j^+, we can suppose that $0 \leq \varphi_j \to (u-v)^+$, $\nabla\varphi_j \to \nabla(u-v)^+$ a.e. in Σ_λ, and that there exist functions $\psi_0 \in L^{p^*}$, $\psi_1 \in L^p$, such that $|\varphi_j| \leq \psi_0$, $|\nabla\varphi_j| \leq \psi_1$ a.e. in Σ_λ.

Taking the functions φ_j as test functions in the equation for u we get

$$\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} \langle |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u, \nabla\varphi_j\rangle dx = \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} u^{p^*-1}\,\varphi_j dx$$

If we can pass to the limit for $j \to \infty$, we obtain

$$\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla u|^{p-2}\langle \nabla u, \nabla(u-u_\lambda)^+\rangle dx = \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} u^{p^*-1}(u-u_\lambda)^+ dx \tag{2.6}$$

So it is enough to justify the passage to the limit, which follows easily from the dominated convergence theorem. In fact, we have that $|u^{p^*-1}\,\varphi_j| \leq u^{p^*-1}\psi_0 \in L^1(\Sigma_\lambda)$ since $\psi_0 \in L^{p^*}(\Sigma_\lambda)$, $u^{p^*-1} \in L^{\frac{p^*}{p^*-1}}(\Sigma_\lambda)$. Analogously we have that $||\nabla u|^{p-2}\langle\nabla u, \nabla\varphi\rangle| \leq |\nabla u|^{p-1}\psi_1 \in L^1(\Sigma_\lambda)$ since $\psi_1 \in L^p(\Sigma_\lambda)$, $|\nabla u|^{p-1} \in L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Sigma_\lambda)$.

Since u_λ satisfies the same equation, analogously we get

$$\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla u_\lambda|^{p-2}\langle \nabla u_\lambda, \nabla(u-u_\lambda)^+\rangle dx = \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} {u_\lambda}^{p^*-1}(u-u_\lambda)^+ dx \tag{2.7}$$

Subtracting equation (2.7) from (2.6) we get

$$\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} \langle |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u - |\nabla u_\lambda|^{p-2}\nabla u_\lambda, \nabla(u-u_\lambda)^+\rangle dx = \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (u^{p^*-1} - {u_\lambda}^{p^*-1})(u-u_\lambda)^+ dx$$

and, by (2.1), we have

$$\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}(|\nabla u|+|\nabla u_\lambda|)^{p-2}|\nabla(u-u_\lambda)^+|^2dx \le \frac{1}{C_1}\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}(u^{p^*-1}-u_\lambda^{p^*-1})(u-u_\lambda)^+dx\,. \tag{2.8}$$

Since we are assuming now $p^* > 2$, using Lagrange Theorem, Hölder's and Sobolev's inequalities on the right hand side of (2.8), we obtain

(2.9)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}(u^{p^*-1}-u_\lambda^{p^*-1})(u-u_\lambda)^+dx \le (p^*-1)\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}u^{p^*-2}[(u-u_\lambda)^+]^2dx\\
\le\ & (p^*-1)\left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}u^{p^*}dx\right)^{\frac{p^*-2}{p^*}}\left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}[(u-u_\lambda)^+]^{p^*}dx\right)^{\frac{2}{p^*}}\\
\le\ & \frac{(p^*-1)}{S^{2/p}}\left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}u^{p^*}dx\right)^{\frac{p^*-2}{p^*}}\left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}|\nabla(u-u_\lambda)^+|^pdx\right)^{\frac{2}{p}},
\end{aligned}$$

being S the Sobolev's constant (see(1.3)). Let us note now that by Hölder's inequality we have

(2.10)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}|\nabla(u-u_\lambda)^+|^pdx = \int_{\Sigma_\lambda}\left[(|\nabla u|+|\nabla u_\lambda|)^{\frac{p(2-p)}{2}}\right]\left[(|\nabla u|+|\nabla u_\lambda|)^{\frac{p(p-2)}{2}}|\nabla(u-u_\lambda)^+|^p\right]dx\\
\le\ & \left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}(|\nabla u|+|\nabla u_\lambda|)^pdx\right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}}\left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}(|\nabla u|+|\nabla u_\lambda|)^{p-2}|\nabla(u-u_\lambda)^+|^2dx\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}\\
\le\ & C_2\left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}(|\nabla u|+|\nabla u_\lambda|)^{p-2}|\nabla(u-u_\lambda)^+|^2dx\right)^{\frac{p}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that ∇u and ∇u_λ are both in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Let us remark, for later use, that here we absorbed the term $\left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}(|\nabla u|+|\nabla u_\lambda|)^pdx\right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}}$ in the constant C_2, but for the limit case we will need to estimate this term.

Combining equations (2.8), (2.9) and (2.10) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}(|\nabla u|+|\nabla u_\lambda|)^{p-2}|\nabla(u-u_\lambda)^+|^2dx\\
&\le \frac{C_2^{\frac{2}{p}}(p^*-1)}{C_1\,S^{\frac{2}{p}}}\left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}u^{p^*}dx\right)^{\frac{p^*-2}{p^*}}\int_{\Sigma_\lambda}(|\nabla u|+|\nabla u_\lambda|)^{p-2}|\nabla(u-u_\lambda)^+|^2dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Since $u\in L^{p^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ there exists $R_0>0$ such that

$$\frac{C_2^{\frac{2}{p}}(p^*-1)}{C_1\,S^{\frac{2}{p}}}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N\setminus B(0,R_0)}u^{p^*}dx\right)^{\frac{p^*-2}{p^*}} < \frac{1}{2} \tag{2.12}$$

so that if $\lambda < -R_0$ then $\Sigma_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0,R_0)$ and we deduce from (2.11) and (2.12) that $(u-u_\lambda)^+ \equiv 0$.
So we proved that $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$, in fact $(-\infty, -R_0) \subset \Lambda$.

We remark that for simplicity of notations we assumed that we are dealing with the x_1-direction, but R_0 is independent of the direction we are a looking at, namely $(-\infty, -R_0) \subset \Lambda(\nu)$ for every direction $\nu \in S^{N-1}$.

Let us now deal with the limit case $p^* = 2$ (*namely* $p = \frac{2N}{N+2}$). We can repeat verbatim the previous argument that we used to prove (2.11) and since $p^* - 1 = 1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_\lambda|)^{p-2} |\nabla (u-u_\lambda)^+|^2 dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{C_1\, S^{\frac{2}{p}}} \left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_\lambda|)^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}}\, dx \right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}} \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_\lambda|)^{p-2} |\nabla (u-u_\lambda)^+|^2 dx\end{aligned}$$

where we emphasized the factor $\chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}}$ (where χ is the characteristic function of a set), and the term $\left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_\lambda|)^p dx \right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}}$ will be estimated, and not absorbed in the constant $C_2^{\frac{2}{p}}$.
To prove that $(u-u_\lambda)^+ \equiv 0$ for λ negative with $|\lambda|$ large, it is sufficient to show that

$$\frac{1}{C_1\, S^{\frac{2}{p}}} \left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_\lambda|)^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}}\, dx \right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}} < 1\,. \tag{2.13}$$

By simple computations we see that for some $c_p > 0$ depending only on p

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{C_1\, S^{\frac{2}{p}}} \left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_\lambda|)^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}}\, dx \right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}} \\ &\leqslant \frac{c_p}{C_1\, S^{\frac{2}{p}}} \left[\left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla u|^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}}\, dx \right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}} + \left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla u_\lambda|^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}}\, dx \right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}} \right].\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, to prove (2.13), it is sufficient to show that, for λ negative and $|\lambda|$ large both the terms in the last line are arbitrarily small, e.g.

$$\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla u|^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}}\, dx \quad , \quad \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla u_\lambda|^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}}\, dx \;\leq\; \left(\frac{C_1\, S^{\frac{2}{p}}}{4 c_p} \right)^{\frac{p}{2-p}} =: \hat\tau(p)\,.$$

Since $u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, then there exists $R_0' > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0,R_0')} |\nabla u|^p \, dx < \hat\tau(p)\,.$$

So, if $\lambda < -R_0'$ we have that $\Sigma_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0,R_0')$ and $\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla u|^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}}\, dx < \hat\tau(p)$.

To prove (2.13), it is now sufficient to show that, for λ negative and $|\lambda|$ large, we have also for the other term

$$\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla u_\lambda|^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}} \, dx < \left(\frac{C_1 \, S^{\frac{2}{p}}}{4 c_p} \right)^{\frac{p}{2-p}} =: \hat{\tau}(p) \, .$$

Since $u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap C^{1,\alpha}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $u > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, we have that $\lim_{\delta \to 0} |\nabla u|^p \, \chi_{\{u \leqslant \delta\}} = 0$, so that by dominated convergence there exists $\hat{\delta} > 0$ small, depending only on u and not depending on λ, such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\lambda|^p \, \chi_{\{u_\lambda \leqslant \hat{\delta}\}} \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^p \, \chi_{\{u \leqslant \hat{\delta}\}} \, dx \leqslant \frac{\hat{\tau}(p)}{4} \, . \tag{2.14}$$

Furthermore, since $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, there exists $\bar{\delta}$, depending only on u and not depending on λ, such that, since $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}_\lambda(\mathcal{E}))$ (here $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ stands for the Lebesgue measure) we have that

$$\text{if } \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}) \leqslant \bar{\delta} \ \text{ then, } \ \int_{\mathcal{E}} |\nabla u_\lambda|^p \, dx \, = \, \int_{R_\lambda(\mathcal{E})} |\nabla u|^p \, dx \leqslant \frac{\hat{\tau}(p)}{4} \, . \tag{2.15}$$

Note now that, for $\hat{\delta}$ fixed as in (2.14) and $\bar{\delta}$ as in (2.15), there exists $R_0'' > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0,R_0'')} u^{p^*} \, dx \leqslant \bar{\delta} \, \hat{\delta}^{p^*}$$

So, if $\lambda < -R_0''$ we have that $\Sigma_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0, R_0'')$ and

$$\mathcal{L}\left(\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\} \cap \{u_\lambda \geqslant \hat{\delta}\} \cap \Sigma_\lambda \right) \leqslant \mathcal{L}\left(\{u \geqslant \hat{\delta}\} \cap \Sigma_\lambda \right) \leqslant \frac{1}{\hat{\delta}^{p^*}} \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} u^{p^*} \, dx \leqslant \bar{\delta} \, .$$

Using (2.15) we have $\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla u_\lambda|^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}} \chi_{\{u_\lambda \geqslant \hat{\delta}\}} \, dx \leq \frac{\hat{\tau}(p)}{4}$ and exploiting also (2.14)

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla u_\lambda|^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}} \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla u_\lambda|^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}} \chi_{\{u_\lambda \geqslant \hat{\delta}\}} \, dx + \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla u_\lambda|^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}} \, \chi_{\{u_\lambda < \hat{\delta}\}} \, dx \\ &\leq \frac{\hat{\tau}(p)}{2} \, , \end{aligned}$$

and (2.13) is proved, so that also in this case we have $(u - u_\lambda)^+ \equiv 0$ for λ negative with $|\lambda|$ large.

It is easy to see that also in the limit case the values that we have to consider for λ do not depend on the direction that we consider. In fact R_0', and $\hat{\delta}$ and $\bar{\delta}$, which next determine R_0'', depend only on u, and do not depend on the direction under consideration, and taking $R_0 = \max(R_0', R_0'')$, we have that $(-\infty, -R_0) \subset \Lambda(\nu)$ for every direction $\nu \in S^{N-1}$.

Having proved that $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$ we can define $\lambda_0 = \sup \Lambda$ and it easy to see that

$$\lambda_0 < +\infty$$

since u is positive and $u \in L^{p^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$: if we had $\lambda_0 = +\infty$ then, u would be positive and nondecreasing in the x_1-direction in $\mathbb{R}^N$.

STEP 2 *Here we show that in the maximal cap Σ_{λ_0} either i) or ii) occur.*

Let us first deal with the case $p^* > 2$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a connected component of $\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z_{\lambda_0}$. By the Strong Comparison Principle it follows that $u < u_\lambda$ or $u \equiv u_\lambda$ in all $\mathcal{C}$.

If $u \equiv u_{\lambda_0}$ in Σ_{λ_0} then (i) holds.
If instead $u \not\equiv u_{\lambda_0}$ in Σ_{λ_0} but $u \equiv u_{\lambda_0}$ in at least one connected component $\mathcal{C}$ then (ii) holds.

Therefore, we have to show that it is not possible that $u < u_{\lambda_0}$ in *every* connected component $\mathcal{C}$ of $\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z_{\lambda_0}$.

Suppose by contradiction that $u < u_{\lambda_0}$ in $\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z_{\lambda_0}$ and let $\eta > 0$ be arbitrarily small (to be fixed later).
By the results in [11], [36] and [37], we know that $\mathcal{L}(Z_u) = 0$, where $\mathcal{L}(A)$ is the Lebesgue measure of a set A.
This and the fact that $u \in L^{p^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ allow us to fix a compact $K = K_\eta \subset \Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z_u \subset \Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z_{\lambda_0}$ such that

$$\int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus K} u^{p^*} dx = \int_{(\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z_u) \setminus K} u^{p^*} dx \leq \frac{\eta}{2}\,. \tag{2.16}$$

By the continuity of the integrals with respect to λ, we can fix $\bar\varepsilon > 0$, such that we have for $K = K_\eta$

$$K \subset \Sigma_\lambda \setminus Z_u\,, \quad \int_{\Sigma_\lambda \setminus K} u^{p^*} dx \leq \eta \qquad \forall \lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \bar\varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \bar\varepsilon) \tag{2.17}$$

and, since $u_{\lambda_0} - u \geq \alpha > 0$ in $K = K_\eta$, by continuity we have that $u_\lambda - u$ is positive in K if λ is close to λ_0, so that, taking $\bar\varepsilon$ smaller if necessary we can suppose that

$$u < u_\lambda \quad \text{in} \quad K \qquad \forall \lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \bar\varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \bar\varepsilon)\,. \tag{2.18}$$

For such values of λ we consider $(u - u_\lambda)^+$ as a test function in (1.1) and, since $(u - u_\lambda)^+ \equiv 0$ in $K = K_\eta$, arguing exactly as in Step 1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Sigma_\lambda \setminus K} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_\lambda|)^{p-2} |\nabla (u - u_\lambda)^+|^2 dx \\
&\leq C \left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda \setminus K} u^{p^*} dx \right)^{\frac{p^*-2}{p^*}} \int_{\Sigma_\lambda \setminus K} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_\lambda|)^{p-2} |\nabla (u - u_\lambda)^+|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to (2.17), we can assume that $\eta > 0$ is sufficiently small so that $\forall\, \lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \bar\varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \bar\varepsilon)$

$$C \left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda \setminus K} u^{p^*} dx \right)^{\frac{p^*-2}{p^*}} < 1.$$

Therefore, for such values of λ we obtain that $u \le u_\lambda$ in $\Sigma_\lambda \setminus K$, and by (2.18) we get actually that $u \le u_\lambda$ in Σ_λ for any $\lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \bar\varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \bar\varepsilon)$. In particular, this holds for $\lambda > \lambda_0$ and close to λ_0, and this is a contradiction with the definition of λ_0. So we can conclude that $u \equiv u_{\lambda_0}$ in at least one connected component $\mathcal{C}$ of $\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z_{\lambda_0}$.

Moreover, by symmetry $|\nabla u(x)| = |\nabla u_{\lambda_0}(x)|$ if $x \in \mathcal{C}$ so that by definition (2.3) follows.

Let us now deal with the case $p^* = 2$ (*namely* $p = \frac{2N}{N+2}$).
The proof is entirely analogous to the case $p^* > 2$. As in Step 1, the only change is the estimation of the term $\int_{\Sigma_\lambda \setminus K} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_\lambda|)^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}} \, dx$ instead of the term $\int_{\Sigma_\lambda \setminus K} u^{p^*} dx$, but it is not needed any fine estimate (as was the case in Step 1 for the limit case).
More precisely, supposing by contradiction that $u < u_{\lambda_0}$ in $\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z_{\lambda_0}$ and given $\eta > 0$ arbitrarily small, since $(|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_{\lambda_0}|)^p \in L^1(\Sigma_{\lambda_0})$, we can choose a compact set $K = K_\eta \subset \Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z_u \subset \Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z_{\lambda_0}$ such that

$$\int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus K} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_{\lambda_0}|)^p \, dx = \int_{(\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z_u) \setminus K} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_{\lambda_0}|)^p \, dx \le \frac{\eta}{2}$$

and $u_{\lambda_0} - u \ge \alpha > 0$ in $K = K_\eta$. By continuity with respect to λ there exists $\bar\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\forall \lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \bar\varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \bar\varepsilon) : \quad K \subset \Sigma_\lambda \quad , \qquad \int_{\Sigma_\lambda \setminus K} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_\lambda|)^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}} \, dx \le \eta$$

$$u < u_\lambda \quad \text{in} \quad K \qquad \forall \lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \bar\varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \bar\varepsilon) \, .$$

Then, considering for the previous values of λ the function $(u - u_\lambda)^+$ as a test function in (1.1), since $(u - u_\lambda)^+ \equiv 0$ in $K = K_\eta$, arguing exactly as in Step 1, we obtain

$$\int_{\Sigma_\lambda \setminus K} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_\lambda|)^{p-2} |\nabla (u - u_\lambda)^+|^2 dx$$

$$\le C \left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda \setminus K} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_\lambda|)^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}} \, dx \right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}} \int_{\Sigma_\lambda \setminus K} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_\lambda|)^{p-2} |\nabla (u - u_\lambda)^+|^2 dx.$$

For a suitable choice of η we have that $C \left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda \setminus K} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla u_\lambda|)^p \, \chi_{\{u \geqslant u_\lambda\}} \, dx \right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}} < 1$ and we conclude as in the previous case.

STEP 3 *Here we prove* (2.4) *and* (2.5) .

Let us remark that by the definition of λ_0 the function u is monotone nondecreasing in the x_1 variable in the cap Σ_{λ_0}.

Let us suppose by contradiction that for some $\mu < \lambda_0$, $y_0 < \mu$ and $x_0 = (y_0, z_0) \in \Sigma_\mu \setminus Z_\mu$ we have that $u(x_0) = u_\mu(x_0)$. Then, by the Strong Comparison Principle it follows that $u \equiv u_\mu$ in the connected component $\mathcal{C}$ of $\Sigma_\mu \setminus Z_\mu$ to which x_0 belongs, so that $|\nabla u(x_0)| = |\nabla u_\mu(x_0)| \neq 0$. If $\mu < \lambda \leq \lambda_0$ and $R_\mu(R_\lambda(x_0)) \in \mathcal{C}$ we have $u(x_0) \leq u\left(R_\lambda(x_0)\right) = u\left(R_\mu(R_\lambda(x_0))\right)$, so that for $y < y_0$, with $y_0 - y$ small we have $u(y_0, z_0) \leq u(y, z_0)$ and by the monotonicity of u in the cap Σ_{λ_0} we obtain that $u(y_0, z_0) = u(y, z_0)$ for $y < y_0$, with $y_0 - y$ small. So for y belonging to a nonvoid maximal interval (a, y_0) we have that $u(y_0, z_0) = u(y, z_0)$, and it follows easily that $a = -\infty$: if $a > -\infty$ repeating the previous argument with μ substituted by $\frac{a+y_0}{2}$ we obtain that $u(y_0, z_0) = u(y, z_0)$ if $y < a$ is close to a.

So we proved that if for some $\mu < \lambda_0$, $y_0 < \mu$ and $x_0 = (y_0, z_0) \in \Sigma_\mu \setminus Z_\mu$ we have that $u(x_0) = u_\mu(x_0)$ then $u(y, z_0) \equiv c$ for $y \in (-\infty, y_0)$.
The same argument can be repeated verbatim for all points close to the starting point (y_0, z_0), and this easily allows to conclude that u would be strictly bounded away from zero in a strip $(-\infty, b) \times B_{\mathbb{R}^{N-1}}(z_0, r)$, contradicting the fact that $u \in L^{p^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, so that (2.4) follows.

Finally, (2.5) follows from the previous inequality and the usual Hopf's Lemma for strictly elliptic operators, since the difference $u - u_\lambda$ satisfies a uniformly elliptic equations in a neighborhood of any noncritical point. In fact, let $x = (\lambda, z) \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z$, i.e. $\lambda < \lambda_0$ and $\nabla u(x) \neq 0$. In a ball $B = B_r(x)$ we have that $|\nabla u| \geq \epsilon > 0$, so that $|\nabla u|, |\nabla u_\lambda| \geq \epsilon > 0$ in $B \cap \Sigma_\lambda$. This implies by standard results that $u \in C^2(B)$ and that the difference $u_\lambda - u$ satisfies a linear strictly elliptic equation $L(u_\lambda - u) = 0$. On the other hand we have, by (2.4) that $u_\lambda - u > 0$ in $B \cap \Sigma_\lambda$ while $u(x) = u_\lambda(x)$ because x belongs to T_λ. Hence, by the usual Hopf's lemma we get $0 > \frac{\partial(u_\lambda - u)}{\partial x_1}(x) = -2\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(x)$ i.e. (2.5) holds. □

Remark 2.6. *In the proof we assumed for simplicity of notations that the direction involved was the x_1-direction, but some of the results are uniform w.r.t. directions. In particular:*

- *in Step 1 we proved that there exists $R_0 > 0$ such that $(-\infty, -R_0) \subset \Lambda(\nu)$ for* every *direction $\nu \in S^{N-1}$.*
- *In Step 2 we showed (for $\nu_0 = e_1$) that if $u < u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}$ in $\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}$, then we can obtain the inequality $u \leq u^{\nu_0}_\lambda$ in $\Sigma^{\nu_0}_\lambda$ for any λ in a neighborhood of λ_0. Analogously we can move direction close to ν_0 and the proof is entirely analogous. Namely the following holds*

Lemma 2.7. *Let ν_0 be a direction in $\mathbb{R}^N$.*

i) *Let $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda(\nu_0)$ i.e. $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda_0(\nu_0)$.*
If $u < u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}$ in $(\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0})$ (this happens in particular if $\lambda_0 < \lambda_0(\nu_0)$ by (2.4)), then, there exists $\bar\varepsilon > 0$ such that $u \leq u^\nu_\lambda$ in Σ^ν_λ $\forall\ \lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \bar\varepsilon\ ,\ \lambda_0 + \bar\varepsilon)$, $\forall\ \nu \in I_{\bar\varepsilon}(\nu_0)$, where $I_{\bar\varepsilon}(\nu_0) := \{\nu\ :\ |\nu| = 1\ ,\ |\nu - \nu_0| < \bar\varepsilon\}$.

ii) *Let $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\nu_0)$, and let $F_{\nu_0} = \{x \in \Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} : u(x) = u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}(x)\}$.*
There exists $\bar\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $\lambda_1 \in (\lambda_0 - \bar\varepsilon\ ,\ \lambda_0 + \bar\varepsilon)$ and for any direction $\nu_1 \in I_{\bar\varepsilon}(\nu_0) := \{\nu\ :\ |\nu| = 1\ ,\ |\nu - \nu_0| < \bar\varepsilon\}$ the following holds:

if we have $u < u^{\nu_1}_{\lambda_1}$ in $F_{\nu_0} \cap \Sigma^{\nu_1}_{\lambda_1}$ *then there exists in turn* $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ ($\varepsilon_1 < \bar\varepsilon - |\lambda_1 - \lambda_0|$, $\varepsilon_1 < \bar\varepsilon - |\nu_1 - \nu_0|$) *such that* $u \le u^\nu_\lambda$ *in* Σ^ν_λ $\forall\, \lambda \in (\lambda_1 - \varepsilon_1\,,\ \lambda_1 + \varepsilon_1)$, $\forall\ \nu \in I_{\varepsilon_1}(\nu_1)$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Step 2 in Theorem 2.5 and we only sketch it in the case $p^* > 2$ (in the limit case $p^* = 2$ the easy changes are as in the proof of Theorem 2.5, Step 2).

i) If $\eta > 0$, choose a compact $K = K_\eta \subset \Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}$ such that $\int_{\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}\setminus K} u^{p^*} dx = \int_{(\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}\setminus Z_u)\setminus K} u^{p^*} dx \le \frac{\eta}{2}$. Then $\int_{\Sigma^\nu_\lambda \setminus K} u^{p^*} dx \le \eta$ will hold not only if λ is sufficiently close to λ_0 but also if ν is sufficiently close to ν_0 so that we can fix $\bar\varepsilon > 0$, such that

$$K \subset \Sigma^\nu_\lambda\,, \quad \int_{\Sigma^\nu_\lambda\setminus K} u^{p^*} dx \le \eta \qquad \forall \lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \bar\varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \bar\varepsilon) \quad \forall \nu \in I_\varepsilon(\nu_0)$$

$$u < u^\nu_\lambda \quad \text{in} \quad K \qquad \forall \lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \bar\varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \bar\varepsilon) \quad \forall \nu \in I_\varepsilon(\nu_0)\,.$$

Then we proceed as in the previous theorem.

ii) Let us remark that if $x \in F_{\nu_0} = \{x \in \Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} : u(x) = u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}(x)\}$, then by the strong comparison principle $u \equiv u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}$ in the connected component of $\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}$ to which x belongs, so that $|\nabla u(x)| = |\nabla u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}(x)| \neq 0$. So $F_{\nu_0} = \{x \in \Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z_u : u(x) = u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}(x)\}$ and we define $G_{\nu_0} = \left(\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z^u\right) \setminus F_{\nu_0}$, the complementary set with respect to $\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z_u$: $G_{\nu_0} = \{x \in \Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} : u(x) < u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}(x), \nabla u(x) \neq 0\}$.

Given $\eta > 0$ we first select two compact set $K^1 = K^1_\eta \subset G_{\nu_0}$ and $K^2 = K^2_\eta \subset F_{\nu_0}$ such that putting $K = K_\eta = K^1 \cup K^2$ then (2.16) holds, namely $\int_{\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}\setminus K} u^{p^*} dx \le \frac{\eta}{2}$ and $\int_{(\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}\setminus Z_u)\setminus K} u^{p^*} dx \le \frac{\eta}{2}$.

Since $u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} - u$ is positive only in G_{ν_0}, then there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} - u \ge \alpha > 0$ in K^1_η, and we can fix $\bar\varepsilon > 0$, such that we have

$$K = K^1 \cup K^2 \subset \Sigma^\nu_\lambda\,, \quad \int_{\Sigma^\nu_\lambda\setminus K} u^{p^*} dx \le \eta \qquad \forall \lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \bar\varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \bar\varepsilon) \quad \forall \nu \in I_\varepsilon(\nu_0) \tag{2.19}$$

$$u < u^\nu_\lambda \quad \text{in} \quad K^1 \qquad \forall \lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \bar\varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \bar\varepsilon) \quad \forall \nu \in I_\varepsilon(\nu_0)\,.$$

The difference now is that we know that $u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} - u$ is strictly positive only in K^1_η and not in $K = K_\eta = K^1 \cup K^2$.

Nevertheless, if $\nu_1 \in I_{\bar\varepsilon}(\nu_0)$ and $u < u^{\nu_1}_{\lambda_1}$ in $F_{\nu_0} \cap \Sigma^{\nu_1}_{\lambda_1}$ then $u^{\nu_1}_{\lambda_1} - u \ge \beta$ for some $\beta > 0$ in $K = K_\eta = K^1 \cup K^2$. So there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ ($\varepsilon_1 < \bar\varepsilon - |\lambda_1 - \lambda_0|$, $\varepsilon_1 < \bar\varepsilon - |\nu_1 - \nu_0|$) such that

$$u < u^\nu_\lambda \quad \text{in} \quad K \qquad \forall \lambda \in (\lambda_1 - \varepsilon_1, \lambda_1 + \varepsilon_1) \quad \forall \nu \in I_{\varepsilon_1}(\nu_1)\,. \tag{2.20}$$

Then, (2.19) and (2.20) (which are analogous to (2.17) and (2.18)) hold and we proceed as in Step 2 of Theorem 2.5 and deduce that $u \le u^\nu_\lambda$ in Σ^ν_λ $\forall\, \lambda \in (\lambda_1 - \varepsilon_1\,,\ \lambda_1 + \varepsilon_1)$, $\forall\ \nu \in I_{\varepsilon_1}(\nu_1)$. □

Once we have a partial symmetry result, the full symmetry follows by using the technique introduced in [8] for bounded domains and extended in [9] (see also [10]) for unbounded domains.
The idea of the proof is to suppose by contradiction that there exists a direction ν_0 and a connected component C of local symmetry different from the whole cap $\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0(\nu_0)}$ (so that $\partial C \setminus T^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0(\nu_0)} \neq \emptyset$ and there are points x in that boundary where $\nabla u(x) = 0$), and simultaneously move hyperplanes orthogonal to different directions close to ν_0. In this way we get a single connected component C_1 as in the previous theorem that is a local symmetry component for *all* the directions in a neighborhood of a direction ν_1 close to ν_0. Using this component C we can then construct a set $\Gamma \subset \partial C_1$ where u is constant and $\nabla u = 0$, and a ball whose boundary meets Γ and where $u > m$. Using Hopf's Lemma we get then a contradiction, since the points on Γ are critical points of u.

We sketch below the details. Besides Lemma 2.7 we shall make use of the following simple topological lemma, whose proof can be found in [8](Corollary 4.1).

Lemma 2.8. *Let A and B be open connected sets in a topological space and assume that $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ and $A \not\equiv B$. Then, $(\partial A \cap B) \cup (\partial B \cap A) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let us now fix a direction ν_0 such that $u \not\equiv u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0(\nu_0)}$ in $\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0(\nu_0)}$ and let $\bar\varepsilon$ be as in Lemma 2.7 ii) .

Let $\mathcal{F}_{\nu_0}$ be the collection of the connected components C^{ν_0} of $(\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0(\nu_0)} \setminus Z^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0(\nu_0)})$ where $u \equiv u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0(\nu_0)}$. Since $u \not\equiv u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0(\nu_0)}$ in $\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0(\nu_0)}$, there is at least such a component C with $\partial C \setminus T^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0(\nu_0)} \neq \emptyset$, and since the components are open the collection is denumerable. Let $\{C^{\nu_0}_i\}_{i\in I\subset\mathbb{N}}$ be an enumeration of the sets in $\mathcal{F}_{\nu_0}$.

We need to introduce a symmetrized version $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\nu$ of $\mathcal{F}_\nu$.

If $\nabla u(x) = 0$ for all x on ∂C^ν, then define $\tilde C^\nu = C^\nu$. If not, there are points $x \in (\partial C^\nu \cap T^\nu_{\lambda_0(\nu)})$ such that $\nabla u(x) \neq 0$. In such cases, define

$$\tilde C^\nu = C^\nu \cup R^\nu_{\lambda_0(\nu)}(C^\nu) \cup \{x \in (\partial C^\nu \cap T^\nu_{\lambda_0(\nu)}) : \nabla u(x) \neq 0\}.$$

It is easy to see that the sets $\tilde C^\nu$ are open and connected, and moreover (and this is the reason to introduce them) we have that $\nabla u(x) = 0$ for any $x \in \partial \tilde C^\nu$, while $\nabla u(x) \neq 0$ for any $x \in \tilde C^\nu$.

STEP 1 $\lambda_0(\nu)$ *is a continuous function of* ν *at* ν_0.

Let us fix $\varepsilon > 0$, $\varepsilon < \bar\varepsilon$, where $\bar\varepsilon$ is as in Lemma 2.7 ii) .

By the definition of $\lambda_0(\nu_0)$, there exist $\lambda \in (\lambda_0(\nu_0), \lambda_0(\nu_0) + \varepsilon)$ and $x \in \Sigma^{\nu_0}_\lambda$ such that $u(x) > u^{\nu_0}_\lambda(x)$. By continuity of u with respect to ν, there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that for every $\nu \in I_{\delta_1}(\nu_0)$ $x \in \Sigma^\nu_\lambda$ and $u(x) > u^\nu_\lambda(x)$. Hence, for every $\nu \in I_{\delta_1}(\nu_0)$ we have $\lambda_0(\nu) < \lambda_0(\nu_0) + \varepsilon$.

Now we claim that there exists $\delta_2 > 0$ such that $\lambda_0(\nu_0) - \varepsilon < \lambda_0(\nu)$ for any $\nu \in I_{\delta_2}(\nu_0)$.

If this is not true, then there exists a sequence $\{\nu_n\}$ of directions such that $\nu_n \to \nu_0$ and $\lambda_0(\nu_n) \leq \lambda_0(\nu_0) - \varepsilon \ \forall\ n$. By step 1 in Theorem 2.5 we have that $\lambda_0(\nu) \geq -R_0$ for

any direction ν. Thus, the sequence $\lambda_0(\nu_n)$ is bounded and hence, up to a subsequence, it converges to a number $\overline{\lambda} \leq \lambda_0(\nu_0) - \varepsilon$. Then, by (2.4) we have $u < u^{\nu_0}_{\overline{\lambda}}$ in $\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\overline{\lambda}} \setminus Z^{\nu_0}_{\overline{\lambda}}$.

Now by Lemma 2.7, i), we have that $u \leq u^{\nu}_{\lambda}$ in Ω^{ν}_{λ} for any λ close to $\overline{\lambda}$ and any ν close to ν_0.

In particular, this will hold for ν_n and $\lambda_0(\nu_n) + \gamma$, for some n large and γ small, contradicting the definition of $\lambda_0(\nu_n)$.

Thus, it follows that

$$\forall\, \varepsilon > 0\, \exists\, \delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0 : \quad \lambda_0(\nu_0) - \varepsilon < \lambda_0(\nu) < \lambda_0(\nu_0) + \varepsilon \qquad \forall\, \nu \in I_\delta(\nu_0)\,. \tag{2.21}$$

STEP 2 *Here we prove that if* $0 < \bar{\delta} \leq \min\{\delta(\bar{\varepsilon}), \bar{\varepsilon}\}$ *(where* $\delta(\bar{\varepsilon})$ *is as in* (2.21)*) then for each* $\nu \in I_{\bar{\delta}}(\nu_0)$*, there exists* $i \in I$ *such that* $\tilde{C}^{\nu_0}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\nu$.
This means that for every direction ν close to ν_0, one of the connected components of local symmetry in the direction ν_0 is also a component of local symmetry in the direction ν.
The crucial remark that will help us is the following: if ν_1 and ν_2 are two directions and $C^{\nu_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\nu_1}$, $C^{\nu_2} \in \mathcal{F}_{\nu_2}$, then either $\tilde{C^{\nu_1}} \cap \tilde{C^{\nu_2}} = \emptyset$ or $\tilde{C^{\nu_1}} \equiv \tilde{C^{\nu_2}}$. This is a consequence of Lemma 2.8. In fact, if $\tilde{C^{\nu_1}} \cap \tilde{C^{\nu_2}} \neq \phi$ and $\tilde{C^{\nu_1}} \not\equiv \tilde{C^{\nu_2}}$ then one set must meet the boundary of the other, and this is impossible since $\nabla u(x) = 0$ for any $x \in \partial \tilde{C}^{\nu_k}$, while $\nabla u(x) \neq 0$ for any $x \in \tilde{C}^{\nu_k}$, $k = 1, 2$.

Let now $\nu \in I_{\bar{\delta}}(\nu_0)$, with $0 < \bar{\delta} \leq \min\{\delta(\bar{\varepsilon}), \bar{\varepsilon}\}$ so that $|\nu - \nu_0|$, $|\lambda_0(\nu) - \lambda_0(\nu_0)| < \bar{\varepsilon}$, and suppose by contradiction that $u < u^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$ in $F_{\nu_0} \cap \Sigma^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$ where $F_{\nu_0} = \{x \in \Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0} : u(x) = u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0}(x)\} = \cup_{i \in I} C^{\nu_0}_i$. By Lemma 2.7 ii) we would have $u < u^{\nu}_{\lambda}$ in Σ^{ν}_{λ} for $\lambda > \lambda_0(\nu)$, contradicting the definition of $\lambda_0(\nu)$.
So we have proved that there exists $i \in I$ (I is the index set of the enumeration of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\nu_0}$) and $x \in \tilde{C}^{\nu_0}_i$ such that $u(x) = u^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)}(x)$. Since $\nabla u(x) \neq 0$ by the strong comparison principle $u \equiv u^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$ in the component $\tilde{C}^{\nu}$ of $\Sigma^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)} \setminus Z^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$ to which x belongs. Then $\tilde{C}^{\nu} = \tilde{C}^{\nu_0}_i$ by the previous remark (components $\tilde{C^{\nu_1}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\nu_1}$, $\tilde{C^{\nu_2}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\nu_2}$ either coincide or are disjoint).

STEP 3 *There exists a direction* ν' *near* ν_0 *and a set* $\tilde{C}^{\nu_0}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\nu_0} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\nu'}$ *such that the set* $\tilde{C}^{\nu_0}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\nu$*, for* every *direction* ν *in a neighbourhood* $\overline{I_{\delta'}(\nu')} = \{\nu : |\nu - \nu'| \leq \delta'\}$ *of* ν' .
Let $\{\tilde{C}_i^{\nu_0}\}_{i \in I}$ be an enumeration of the sets in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\nu_0}$, and let $\bar{\delta}$ be as in Step 2.
If there exists δ_0, $0 < \delta_0 \leq \bar{\delta}$ such that $\tilde{C}^{\nu_0}_1 \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\nu$ for all $\nu \in \overline{I_{\delta_0}(\nu_0)}$, then Step 3 is proved, with $\nu' = \nu_0$, $\delta' = \delta_0$ and we are done.
If not, there exists $\nu_1 \in \overline{I_{\bar{\delta}}(\nu_0)}$ such that $\tilde{C}^{\nu_0}_1 \notin \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\nu_1}$, and we show now that $\tilde{C}^{\nu_0}_1 \notin \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\nu$ for all the directions ν sufficiently close to ν_1.
If $S_1 \subset C^{\nu_0}_1 \cap \Sigma^{\nu_1}_{\lambda_0(\nu_1)}$ is compact, we have that $u^{\nu_1}_{\lambda_0(\nu_1)} - u \geq \gamma > 0$ in S_1 so that for the directions ν close to ν_1 we have $u < u^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$ in S_1, and by the strong comparison principle $\tilde{C}^{\nu_0}_1 \notin \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\nu$.
So there exists $\delta_1 \leq \bar{\delta} - |\nu_1 - \nu_0|$ such that $\tilde{C}^{\nu_0}_1 \notin \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\nu$ for any $\nu \in \overline{I_{\delta_1}(\nu_1)}$.
Now we check if $\tilde{C}^{\nu_0}_2 \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\nu$ for all $\nu \in \overline{I_{\delta_1}(\nu_1)}$.
If not, we find a direction $\nu_2 \in \overline{I_{\delta_1}(\nu_1)}$ and a neighborhood $\overline{I_{\delta_2}(\nu_2)}$ such that $\delta_2 \leq \delta_1 -$

$|\nu_2 - \nu_1|$ and $\tilde{C}_1^{\nu_0}$, $\tilde{C}_2^{\nu_0} \notin \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\nu$ for any $\nu \in \overline{I_{\delta_2}(\nu_2)}$.
Proceeding in this way,

(i) either we stop at k'th stage where for $k \in N$ we have $\tilde{C}_{k+1}^{\nu_0} \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\nu \; \forall \, \nu \in \overline{I_{\delta_k}(\nu_k)}$
(ii) or the process does not stop at all and $I = \mathbb{N}$.

Now we claim that (ii) cannot arise. In case (ii), we obtain a sequence of nested compact sets $\{\overline{I_{\delta_i}(\nu_i)}\}_{i\in I}$ with the finite intersection property. Then, by Cantor's intersection theorem $\cap_{i\in I}\overline{I_{\delta_i}(\nu_i)} \neq \phi$. For the direction ν in this intersection, $\tilde{C}_i^{\nu_0} \notin \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\nu$ for any i. But this contradicts Step 2, thus Step 3 now follows.

STEP 4 *$u \equiv u^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0(\nu_0)}$ in $\Sigma^{\nu_0}_{\lambda_0(\nu_0)}$ for any direction ν and u is radial.*

Let $\tilde{C}_i^{\nu_1}$ be as in Step 3 and let $x_0 \in \partial C \setminus T^{\nu_1}_{\lambda_0(\nu_1)}$, so that $x_0 \cdot \nu_1 < \lambda_0(\nu_1)$, $\nabla u(x_0) = 0$, and let $x_0' = R^{\nu_1}_{\lambda_0(\nu_1)}(x_0)$. The set $\Gamma = \{R^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)}(x_0') = R^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)}(R^{\nu_1}_{\lambda_0(\nu_1)}(x_0)) \, : \, \nu \in \overline{I_{\bar\delta}(\nu_1)}\}$ is compact, since it is the image of a compact set for the continuous function $\nu \in \overline{I_{\bar\delta}(\nu_1)} \mapsto R^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)}(x_0')$.

By definition, $\Gamma \subset Z_u$ and $u = m = u(x_0) = u(x_0')$ is constant on Γ.

Moreover the projection of Γ on the hyperplane $T^{\nu_1}_{\lambda_0\,(\nu_1)}$ contains an $N-1$-dimensional ball $B_{\mathbb{R}^{N-1}}(z_0, \alpha)$ open in $T^{\nu_1}_{\lambda_0\,(\nu_1)}$.
This is impossible by Proposition 5.1 in [9] which state precisely that such a set cannot exist. For the reader's convenience we give here a simple proof in our case, assuming for simplicity that the direction is $\nu_1 = e_1$ and $x_0 = (y_0, z_0)$, with $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$, $y_0 < \lambda_0 = \lambda_0(e_1)$, and $x_0' = (y_0', z_0) = (2\lambda_0 - y_0, z_0)$ where $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(e_1)$.

Observe that since the function $\lambda_0(\nu)$ is continuous, taking $\bar\delta$ smaller if necessary, the set Γ is a (compact) subset of the half space $\Sigma_{\lambda_0} = \Sigma^{e_1}_{\lambda_0(e_1)}$, it has a positive distance d from the hyperplane $T_{\lambda_0} = T^{e_1}_{\lambda_0(e_1)}$, and if m is the constant value of u on Γ, by the monotonicity of u in the cap Σ_{λ_0}, we have that $u \geq m$ in the part R_Γ of Σ_{λ_0} to the right of Γ, i.e. in the segments parallel to the direction x_1 going from each point $R^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)}(x_0')$, $\nu \in \overline{I_{\bar\delta}(e_1)}$, to the hyperplane T_{λ_0}.

If $d = \min\{ \text{ dist } (\Gamma, T_{\lambda_0}) \, , \, \alpha\} > 0$ (where the projection of Γ on the hyperplane $T^{\nu_1}_{\lambda_0\,(\nu_1)}$ contains an $N-1$-dimensional ball $B_{\mathbb{R}^{N-1}}(z_0, \alpha)$ open in $T^{\nu_1}_{\lambda_0\,(\nu_1)}$), we can move the balls $B_\lambda = B\left((\lambda, z_0), \frac{d}{2}\right)$ decreasing λ from λ_0 until $\overline{B_\lambda}$ first touches Γ in a point $\bar x \in \Gamma \cap \partial B_\lambda$. This will happen for $\bar\lambda \leq \lambda_0 - \frac{d}{2}$ and a ball $B = B_{\bar\lambda} = B\left((\bar\lambda, z_0), \frac{d}{2}\right) \subset R_\Gamma \subset \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$.

Since $-\Delta_p(u-m) = u^{p^*-1} > 0$ in B and $u - m \geq 0$ in B, we have that $u > m$ in B and by Hopf's Lemma we have $\nabla u(\bar x) \neq 0$, and this contradicts the fact that Γ is a subset of Z_u.

So it is impossible that ii) holds in Theorem 2.5 and this means that for any direction ν we have $u \equiv u^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$ in $\Sigma^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$.

Furthermore we can conclude using the same method that $Z_u \cap \Sigma^{\nu}_{\lambda_0\,(\nu)} = \emptyset$ for any direction ν.

Thus, u is strictly increasing in every direction ν in $\Sigma^{\nu}_{\lambda_0\,(\nu)}$, with $u \equiv u^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$ in $\Sigma^{\nu}_{\lambda_0(\nu)}$.

Considering now N linearly independent directions in $\mathbb{R}^N$, the final symmetry result follows: u is radially symmetric about some point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ $(x_0 = \cap_{k=1}^N T^{e_k}_{\lambda_0(e_k)})$, which is the only critical point of u, and it is strictly radially decreasing.

□

3. Proof of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4

The proof of Theorem 1.3 and the proof of Theorem 1.4 are direct consequences of Theorem 1.2 and the results in [30].
Let us only provide a few details for the reader's convenience.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Once that Theorem 1.2 is proved, the proof follows directly by Theorem 1.2 in [30] since the solutions to the critical problem in the whole space are now classified by (1.2). □

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let us first observe that we are in position to apply Theorem 1.3.
Let us consider the case (i).
It is standard to see that, if v_0 is not trivial, then

$$J(v_0) > \frac{S^{\frac{N}{p}}}{N}\,.$$

This follows using v_0 as a test function in the equation $-\Delta_p v_0 = v_0^{p^*-1}$ in Ω, and then, exploiting the Sobolev's inequality, recalling that the best Sobolev's constant is not achieved in bounded domains. Therefore, (i) follows by (1.5) recalling that

$$J_\infty(\mathcal{U}_{\lambda_i,x_i}) = \frac{S^{\frac{N}{p}}}{N}\,.$$

Let us now consider the case (ii).

We deduce that $k = 1$ in this case exploiting again the fact that $J_\infty(\mathcal{U}_{\lambda_i,x_i}) = \frac{S^{\frac{N}{p}}}{N}$ and (1.5). Then, we set $\lambda_1 = \lambda$ and $x_1 = x_0$ and (ii) is proved.

Finally, exploiting again the fact that $J_\infty(\mathcal{U}_{\lambda_i,x_i}) = \frac{S^{\frac{N}{p}}}{N}$, we deduce that $c = \frac{S^{\frac{N}{p}}}{N}$. Namely, if $S^{\frac{N}{p}}/N < c < 2S^{\frac{N}{p}}/N$, necessarily (i) occurs. □

References

[1] A. Bahri, Y. Li and O. Rey, *On a variational problem with lack of compactness: the topological effect of the critical points at infinity*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 3 (1), 1995, 67–93.

[2] M.F. Bidaut-Véron, *Local and global behavior of solutions of quasilinear equations of Emden-Fowler type*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 107(4), 1989, 293–324.

[3] L. Caffarelli, B. Gidas and J. Spruck, *Asymptotic symmetry and local behavior of semilinear elliptic equations with critical sobolev growth*. Comm. Pur. Appl. Math., 42(3), 1989, 271–297.

[4] W.X. Chen and C. Li, *Classification of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations*. Duke Math. J., 62(3), 1991, 615–622.

[5] J.M. Coron, *Topologie et cas limite del injections de Sobolev*. C.R. Acad. Sc. Paris, 299, 1984, 209–212.

[6] L. Damascelli, *Comparison theorems for some quasilinear degenerate elliptic operators and applications to symmetry and monotonicity results*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 15(4), 1998, 493–516.

[7] L. Damascelli, A Farina, B. Sciunzi and E. Valdinoci, *Liouville results for m-Laplace equations of Lane-Emden-Fowler type*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 26(4), 2009, 1099–1119.

[8] L. Damascelli, F. Pacella, *Monotonicity and symmetry of solutions of p-Laplace equations,* $1 < p < 2$*, via the moving plane method*. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci., 26 (4), 1998, 689–707.

[9] L. Damascelli, F. Pacella, M. Ramaswamy, *Symmetry of Ground States of p-Laplace equations via the moving plane method*. Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., 148, 1999, 291–308.

[10] L. Damascelli, M. Ramaswamy, *Symmetry of* C^1 *solutions of p-Laplace equations in* R^N*.* Adv. Nonlinear Stud., 1(1), 2001, 40–64

[11] L. Damascelli, B. Sciunzi, *Regularity, monotonicity and symmetry of positive solutions of m-Laplace equations.* J. Differential Equations, 206(2), 2004, 483–515.

[12] L. Damascelli and B. Sciunzi, *Monotonicity of the solutions of some quasilinear elliptic equations in the half-plane, and applications*. Diff. Int. Eq., 23(5-6), 2010, 419–434.

[13] L. Damascelli, B. Sciunzi, *Harnack inequalities, maximum and comparison principles, and regularity of positive solutions of m-Laplace equations*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 25(2), 2006, 139–159.

[14] M. Degiovanni, A. Musesti and M. Squassina, *On the regularity of solutions in the PucciSerrin identity*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 18(3), 2003, 317–334.

[15] E. Di Benedetto, $C^{1+\alpha}$ *local regularity of weak solutions of degenerate elliptic equations*. Nonlinear Anal., 7(8), 1983, 827–850. 1

[16] A. Farina, L. Montoro and B. Sciunzi, *Monotonicity and one-dimensional symmetry for solutions of* $-\Delta_p u = f(u)$ *in half-spaces*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 43, 2012, 123–145.

[17] A. Farina, L. Montoro and B. Sciunzi, *Monotonicity of solutions of quasilinear degenerate elliptic equation in half-spaces*. Math. Ann., 357(3), 2013, 855–893.

[18] M. Flucher and J. Wei, *Semilinear Dirichlet problem with nearly critical exponent, asymptotic location of hot spots*. Manuscripta Math., 94(3), 1997, 337–346.

[19] J. Garcia Azorero and I. Peral Alonso, *Existence and non-uniqueness for the p- laplacien: Nonlinear eigenvalues*. Commun. in P.D.E., 12(12), 1987, 1389–1430.

[20] J. Garcia Azorero and I. Peral Alonso, *On limits of solutions of elliptic problems with nearly critical exponents*. Commun. in P.D.E., 17(11-12), 1992, 2113–2126.

[21] B. Gidas, W. M. Ni, and L. Nirenberg, *Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle*. Comm. Math. Phys., 68(3), 1979, 209–243.

[22] B. Gidas, W. M. Ni, and L. Nirenberg, *Symmetry of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations in* $\mathbb{R}^N$. Math. Anal. Appl., Part A, Advances in Math. Suppl. Studies, 7A, 1981, 369–403.

[23] M. Guedda, L. Veron, *Local and global properties of solutions of quasilinear elliptic equations*. J. Differential Equations, 76, 1988, 159–189.

[24] M. Guedda and L. Veron, *Quasilinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents*. Nonlinear Anal., 13, 1989, 879–902.

[25] Z.C. Han, *Asymptotic approach to singular solutions for nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponent*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 8(2), 1991, 159–174.

[26] T. Kuusi and G. Mingione, *Universal potential estimates*. J. Funct. Anal., 262, 2012, 4205–4269.

[27] G.M. Lieberman, *Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations.* Nonlinear Anal., 12(11), 1988, 1203–1219.

[28] P.L. Lions, *The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations.* Rev. Matematica Iberoamericana, 1(1), 1985, 145–201.

[29] P.L. Lions, *The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The limit case, part 2.* Rev. Matematica Iberoamericana, 1(2), 1985, 45–121.
[30] C. Mercuri, M. Willem, *A global compactness result for the p-Laplacian involving critical nonlinearities.* Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 28(2), 2010, 469–493.
[31] C. Mercuri, B. Sciunzi and M. Squassina, *On Coron's problem for the p-Laplacian.* Preprint.
[32] J. Moser, *A new proof of De Giorgi's theorem concerning the regularity problem for elliptic differential equations.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 13, 1960, 457–468.
[33] I. Peral Alonso, *Multiplicity of solutions for the p-Laplacian.* Lecture Notes, 1997.
[34] P. Pucci, J. Serrin, *The maximum principle.* Birkhauser, Boston, 2007.
[35] O. Rey, *The role of the Green's function in a nonlinear elliptic equation involving the critical Sobolev exponent.* J. Funct. Anal., 89(1), 1990, 1–52.
[36] B. Sciunzi, *Some results on the qualitative properties of positive solutions of quasilinear elliptic equations.* NoDEA. Nonlinear Differential Equations and Applications, 14(3-4), 2007, 315–334.
[37] B. Sciunzi, *Regularity and comparison principles for p-Laplace equations with vanishing source term.* Comm. Cont. Math., DOI: 10.1142/S0219199714500138.
[38] J. Serrin, *Local behavior of solutions of quasi-linear equations.* Acta Math., 111, 1964, 247–302.
[39] J. Serrin, *A symmetry problem in potential theory.* Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 43(4), 1971, 304–318.
[40] J. Serrin and H. Zou, *Symmetry of ground states of quasilinear elliptic equations.* Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 148(4), 1999, 265–290.
[41] M. Struwe, *A global compactness result for elliptic boundary value problems involving limiting nonlinearities.* Math. Z., 187, 1984, 511–517.
[42] G. Talenti, *Best constant in Sobolev inequality.* Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.(4), 110, 1976, 353 – 372.
[43] E. Teixeira, *Regularity for quasilinear equations on degenerate singular sets.* Math. Ann., 358(1-2), 2014, 241–256.
[44] N.S. Trudinger, *Remarks concerning the conformal deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds.* Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (3), 22, 1968, 265 – 274.
[45] P. Tolksdorf, *Regularity for a more general class of quasilinear elliptic equations.* J. Differential Equations, 51(1), 1984, 126–150.
[46] J.L. Vázquez, *A Strong maximum principle for some quasilinear elliptic equations.* Appl. Math. Optim., 12(3), 1984, 191–202.